



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,397	09/28/2003	Tzyh-Jong Wang		2396
38368	7590	06/04/2007		
TZYH-JONG WANG 44 UTICA RD EDISON, NJ 08820			EXAMINER SINGH, RAMNANDAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/605,397

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Sep 28, 2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-23 are objected to because of the following informalities:
The numbering of claims is improper. It should not include letters, such as C1, C2, ... Cn.
2. Claims 7-10, 12-13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because these claims refer to multiple dependent claims.
See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 7-10, 12-13 and their dependent claims have not been further treated on the merits.
3. Claim 1 is further objected to because it recites the limitation "Internet (through LAN or WLAN)" in line 8. Delete the parenthesis used herein to close words.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "for making/receiving" in line 1. It is unclear whether Applicant is claiming "making" or "receiving".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Willig [US 6,952,414 B1].

Regarding claim 1, Willig discloses an iCord telephone system for making and receiving voice phone calls, as shown in Fig. 1, is comprised of

an iCord base station (200) with internet, PSTN and cordless connectivity [Fig. 2];

one iCord cradle with internet connectivity and cordless connectivity [Fig. 2; col. 4, lines 30-40];

one iCord cordless handset (120) with cordless or internet through LAN or WLAN connectivity to the iCord base station directly or through cradles [Fig. 4; col. 1, lines 47-50; col. 4, lines 41-49; col. 4, line 56 to col. 5, line 7];

where the range of the iCord telephone system is extended globally over the internet by implementing end-to-end secured internet connectivity from the iCord handset to the iCord base station [Figs. 1 through 5; col. 4, line 60 to col. 8, line 8].

Here Examiner interprets the word "or" as "alternarive".

Regarding claim 2, Willig further discloses the iCord telephone system, wherein the base station comprises of

a controller (432)for call control and media handling (425) [Fig. 4; col. 6, lines 4-45] ;

a memory (434) coupled to the controller (432) for storing the code and data;

a PSTN module for handling all PSTN signaling and media [Figs. 2-3; col. 4, lines 30-40; col. 4, line 60 to col. 5, line 7].

a cordless module (120) for handling wireless connections between handsets and the said base station [col. 4, lines 56-59];

a LAN module for handling Internet connections between handsets and the base station [Figs. 2-3; col. 1, lines 47-56];

an end-to-end secured Internet connection with each handset registers at the base station, wherein the Internet connection is inherently secured [Fig. 5; col. 6, line 61 to col. 8, line 8].

Regarding claims 3-5, the limitations are shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willig as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Doyle et al [US 20040125777 A1].

Regarding claim 6, although Willig discloses using a local area network (LAN) [col. 1, lines 47-50]; he does not teach expressly using a wireless local area network (WLAN).

Doyle et al teach a system, wherein the handset's cordless module is replace by a WLAN module with wireless Internet connectivity with the base stations [Figs. 1-4; Para: 0004; 0012; 0020; 0022; 0023; 0047].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Doyle et al with Willig in order to extend the use of the personal access device (PAD) of Willig in a wireless environment [Doyle et al; Para: 0004].

10. Claims 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willig as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Janssen et al [US 20030157929 A1].

Regarding claim 16, Willig does not teach expressly using more than one handsets.

Janssen et al teach an iCord telephone system, where incoming calls to the base station alerts all associated handsets and allow any user to answer the phone [Figs. 1-4; Para: 0027-0045].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Janssen et al with Willig in order to enable participating in a conference call [Janssan et al; Para: 0012; 0021].

Regarding claims 17-23, the limitations are shown above.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Warburnton et al [US 20010003706 A1] teaches using multiple handsets [Whole document].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2614

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RNS', with a horizontal line drawn underneath it.